

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of the application as set forth in the outstanding office action. Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-10, 12-14, and 16-20 have been allowed.

Claims 22, 25 and 26 have been objected to as depending from a rejected claim, but are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC 102

Claim 21 stands rejected as being anticipated by Kasugi et al. ("Kasugi"). The rejection is respectfully traversed, on the grounds that a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established, and the reference, to the extent understood, does not describe each limitation of the claim.

The Examiner asserts that Kasugi discloses "air diffusion barrier system (5) protecting the ink reservoir (4) and fluid interconnect from air diffusion for a shelf life of at least a period of six months so that ink delivered to the printing system remain in an unsaturated condition for at least said period of six months." Applicant does not have an English translation of Kasugi, and only has the English abstract provided by applicant in an IDS to the PTO. To the extent understood, there appears no description that the member 5 protects the ink reservoir 4 from air diffusion for a shelf life of at least a period of six months as recited in the claim. Applicant thus respectfully traverses the rejection on the ground that no showing has been made that the reference describes each element of the claimed invention.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 23-24 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Pawlowski, Jr. ("Pawlowski") in view of Kasuga. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established, and the applied references do not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Claim 23 has been amended for clarity.

The Examiner asserts that Pawlowski discloses an ink flow path (16) between the reservoir (14) and the fluid interconnect (24), and one or more air diffusion barrier structures including a first barrier structure for shielding the ink flow path (16) from air diffusion from the external environment (16:21-26). These allegations do not meet the claim limitations of Claim 23, including:

the ink reservoir structure includes a collapsible bag and a chassis structure to which the bag is attached;

the fluid interconnect comprises a fluid passageway formed by the chassis structure leading from the bag to a fluid outlet, and a septum disposed in said passageway at said fluid outlet; and

the air diffusion barrier system includes a first barrier structure for shielding the passageway from air diffusion from an external environment into the fluid path, and a second barrier structure for shielding the fluid outlet from air diffusion into the fluid path from the external environment.

The fluid "passageway" is formed by the chassis structure to which the bag is attached, and thus the conduit 16 of Pawlowski does not read on this limitation, or on the "first barrier structure for shielding the passageway from air diffusion." For this reason alone, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

The Examiner agrees that Pawlowski does not disclose the "second barrier structure" of Claim 23, but alleges that Kasuga discloses in Figures 1-4 an ink cartridge comprising a barrier structure (5) for shielding the fluid outlet (11)

from air diffusion into the ink flow path (not shown) from the external environment. There does not appear to be an ink flow path in Kasuga which corresponds to the fluid passageway recited in Claim 23, or a septum.

The rejection of Claim 23 should be withdrawn because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established, and the applied references do not teach or suggest the claimed invention. The rejection of Claim 24, which depends from Claim 23, should also be withdrawn.

New Claims

New Claims 27-29 have been added, and are also allowable.

Initialed Copy of PTO 1449

The office action did not include an initialed copy of the PTO 1449 mailed to the PTO January 9, which listed the Kasuga reference. It is respectfully requested that an initialed copy of the PTO 1449 be returned with the next action, to insure the Kasuga reference is listed on the front cover of the patent to issue from this application.

CONCLUSION

The outstanding rejections have been addressed, and the application is in condition for allowance. Such favorable reconsideration is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Larry K. Roberts
Registration No. 28,464

Dated: 6/16/04

Law Offices of Larry K. Roberts, Inc.
P.O. Box 8569
Newport Beach, CA 92658-8569
Telephone (949) 640-6200
Facsimile (949) 640-1206